DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 682 EC 220 556

AUTHOR Breiter, Joan
TITLE Gifted Education in a Midwest State: Focus on Inservice.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Convention of the National Association for Gifted Children (Orlando, FL, November 9, 1988). Appendixes A-C (6 pages) have small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Identification; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; State Surveys; Teaching Methods; Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

This paper explores gifted education and plans for inservice teacher education in gifted education programs in Iowa. A survey was conducted of 238 Iowa public school districts having programs for gifted students. Initial analysis of the data involved a frequency count for each of 13 survey items which rated program emphasis on major provisions of gifted education. These provisions included: areas of talent recognized, use of standardized and nonstandardized tests for talent identification, provisions for continuous assessment, articulation with other schools, administrative grouping modifications, provisions for accelerating gifted students, instructional adaptations, balance in the instructional program, special equipment and facilities, guidance and counseling provisions, community resources, and in-service training for teachers and other personnel. Further analysis of the data identified significant relationships between general program/teacher information and the 13 major provisions, and significant relationships among major provisions. For example, teachers in elementary grades gave high emphasis to administrative grouping modifications, while teachers of other grade levels only reported average emphasis ratings for grouping modifications. Those areas which survey respondents perceived as needing more emphasis are considered candidates for increased in-service activities. A copy of the survey instrument is included. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308682

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Gifted Education in a Midwest State: Focus on Inservice

Dr. Joan Breiter

Iowa State University

1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Breiter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: Gifted Education

EC 220554

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the Convention of the National
Association for Gifted Children
Orlando, FL, November 9, 1988

Gifted Education in a Midwest State: Focus on Inservice

Introduction

Iowa has been on the map of the United States for over one hundred years, but is sometimes still confused with Idaho or Ohio, or consigned to the broad section of our country which lies between the Appalachian and Rocky Mountain chains. Iowa, with its population of less than 3,000,000 people and no metropolitan area greater than 250,000 people, is not a state with a seaport, precious minerals, or a renowned cultural center (assets by which many cities on the East or West Coast became known to the world). Iowa is known, however, for assets other than corn, soybeans, cattle, and insurance companies. For years Iowa has been noted for having one of the best educated student bodies in our nation, i.e., good school systems.

In the past fifteen years Iowa schools have experienced growth in the number and kinds of provisions available to meet the needs of those students in the public schools who are identified as gifted and talented. A handout which was part of a packet of information about gifted education was available from the Iowa Department of Education in the mid-1970's. One item in that packet, dated 10/76, recognized the definition of gifted and talented children provided by the U.S. Office of Education, Public Law 91-230, Section 806 as the definition to be used in the state of Iowa. This state, therefore, recognizes (1) general intellectual ability, (2) specific academic aptitude, (3) creative or productive

thinking, (4) leadership ability, (5) visual and performing arts, and (6) psychomotor ability as types of giftedness.

Today, gifted education is increasingly a part of the educational programs offered by school systems. By 1989, all Iowa school districts will be required to offer provisions for the gifted children in their student body. This article will explore aspects of gifted education in the "near part" (1985-86) in Iowa and focus on the plans of inservice in these programs.

The role of inservice education of teachers of gifted and talented youngsters is of national concern and interest. As noted in Rimm and Davis (1985), "Regardless of the specific type of program, teachers will need inservice education dealing with methods for helping gifted and talented children in the regular classroom." Similarly, Kitano and Kirby (1986) note, "In-service training plays a significant role in schools and districts that plan to implement a program for gifted students."

The topic of inservicing teachers of gifted and talented students (GT) is also well represented by journal articles, project descriptions and dissertations. An ERIC search of the years 1981-86 using descriptors which included in-service, teachers, and gifted resulted in 97 "hits." Investigation of these articles indicated they were being published in such reputable periodicals as Gifted Child Quarterly, Gifted Education International, and Gifted Children Today, as well as being the subject of conference presentations. Inservice is a topic of significant in gifted education today.

During Fall Semester, 1985 a survey by mail of the 238 (of a total of 436) Iowa public school districts reported [by the Iowa Department of Education (DE) and/or the consultant for gifted education in each of the fifteen Area Education Agency's (AEAs)] as having a program for gifted students was conducted.

The survey instruments (See Appendices A, B, C) consisted, as noted above, of several sections. Section IA and IB requested information about the teacher's background and responsibilities, and general information about the program's format and history. Section II requested respondents to rate their program as to the strength of emphasis given each of thirteen provisions for gifted students, presented in statement form, according to a scale on which a 3 indicated major emphasis was given that provision in their program to a 0 which indicated no emphasis was given this provision in their program.* Beneath each of the thirteen statements, illustrations of that provision were listed. Respondents were to check each illustration that applied to their program.

It was hoped that the survey would elicit information about two areas: (1) the state of gifted education in Iowa, and (2) the emphasis given to thirteen major provisions for gifted children in local programs.

The initial analysis of survey results was a frequency count for each item. This analysis provided information about Iowa's gifted and

---

* Adapted from A. Harry Passow, Deton J. Brooks, Jr., et. al. A Guide for Rating Provisions for the Gifted, Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia, University, New York, 1960.

talented programs and teachers. Appendix D (pp. 31-32, #1-17) lists observations based upon responses to Section I [(A and B) (General Program and Teacher Information)], while Appendix E (pp. 33-34, #1-17) lists observations based upon responses to Section II (ratings of 13 provisions for gifted in the local program). The analysis, however, did not allow the identification of significant relations. It was decided to conduct a further analysis of the data.

The Chi Square Statistic was employed to identify those crosstabs in which a significant difference was found. Of the 140 crosstabs made, nine crosstabs between items from Section I and Section II were found to be significant. Seven crosstabs were significant at the .05 level, and two crosstabs were found significant at the .01 level. Seven crosstabs between items within Section II were also significant. Seven were significant at the .05 level and six at the .01 level.

This article will present and discuss these two groups of items related at a significant level. They will be identified as Group A (Significant Crosstabs found between Section I and Section II items), and Group B (significant crosstabs within Section II items).

The nine significant crosstabulations to be discussed within this section are to:

1. Compare the major areas of responsibility of the GT teacher and the use of non-standardized tests in the screening and identification of students for the GT program.
2. Compare the provision of continuous assessment of gifted students and the number of years the respondent has spent in her/his present position.

3. Compare the provision of administrative grouping adaptations for gifted students and the grade levels being served.
4. Compare the provisions of acceleration for gifted students and the grade levels being served.
5. Compare the provision of instructional adaptations for gifted students and the size of the total school enrollment.
6. Compare the provision of instructional adaptations for gifted students and the Gifted and Talented (GT) teacher's major assignment.
7. Compare the emphasis on balanced GT program development by the respondent's major assignment.
8. Compare the importance of guidance provisions for gifted students and the GT respondent's major assignment.
9. Compare the use of community resources in the gifted program and the GT respondent's major assignment.

Presentation of Findings: Group A

The relationship between the major areas of responsibility of the GT teacher and the use of non-standardized tests/procedures in the screening and identification of gifted students for the GT program was significant at the .05 level. Those individuals whose responsibility was teaching elementary school subject areas tended to rate the emphasis given to the use of non-standardized tests/procedures in the screening and identification of gifted students as average. A similar percentage of teachers, whose responsibility was a specific subject area or an administrative position, also rated the emphasis given to the use of non-

standardized tests/procedures in the screening and identification of gifted students as average. Six respondents fell into categories other than general elementary or specific subject area (including administration). This group reported rating the use of non-standardized tests/procedures as having heavy emphasis in the program.

Insert Table 1 about here

Another significant relationship was that between the use of continuous assessment in the GT program for purpose of screening, identification, and counseling of students and the number of years the respondents had spent at his/her present position. People with 1-3 years in their present positions tended to identify the emphasis on use of continuous assessment as average, although this level of response did not show a strong trend. However, people with longevity of four or more years in their present positions overwhelmingly (93%) considered the use of continuous assessment in their programs as given average emphasis. Therefore, longevity did not result in an increase of emphasis on the use of continuous assessment for screening, identification, and counseling of gifted students. This relationship was significant at the .05 level of significance.

Insert Table 2 about here

The relationship of the emphasis given to providing administrative grouping modifications for GT children and the grade levels served by the

program was significant at the .05 level. Those involved in programs serving elementary grades rated the emphasis given to grouping modifications in the programs as high. Respondents representing the other combinations of grade levels served (elementary and junior high school levels, elementary and senior high school levels, junior and senior high school levels, and "other" grade level combinations) reported an average emphasis rating to providing administrative grouping modifications for GT children in gifted and talented programs. It would appear that elementary school teachers tend to consider grouping modifications as more important than any of the other groups identified.

Insert Table 3 about here

A crosstab comparison of grade level groupings used in the gifted program and the use of acceleration as part of the program indicated a difference between groups that was significant at the .05 level. Programs that served the following groups - elementary grades, elementary and junior high school, elementary and senior high school, and "other" types of program groupings - tended to give the use of acceleration average emphasis in their programs. Junior and senior high school programs split in an even manner between assigning an average and a major emphasis in the program.

Insert Table 4 about here

In looking at the instructional adaptations made for gifted students in schools of over and under 1,000 students, the difference between these groups was found to be significant at the .05 level. Those schools with 1,000 or fewer students were split in an almost even way regarding instructional adaptations for gifted students as having average or major emphasis in their program. Those schools with an enrollment of over 1,000 students regarded provision of instructional adaptations as a major program emphasis.

Insert Table 5 about here

When examining the major assignment/interest of the GT teacher and the emphasis awarded by this person to providing instructional adaptations for gifted students, one can see a difference between groups that is significant at the .05 level. Teachers whose assignment/interest was at the elementary grade levels were divided in an almost even manner as to whether the emphasis on instructional adaptations was of average or major importance. Teachers at the junior high level appear to feel that instructional adaptations are emphasized to a high degree in their programs. Respondents representing other combinations of elementary school/junior high school/senior high school teacher assignments also indicated instructional adaptations for gifted students were given major emphases in their programs.

Insert Table 6 about here

Crosstabulation of the teacher's major assignment/interest with the factor of program balance was significant at the .01 level. Program balance, as described by Passow in A Guide For Rating Provisions for the Gifted, includes:

1. Opportunity for development of a sound general educational foundation (skills, knowledges represented by the schools usual curriculum) and for going beyond the curriculum usually taught to explore and specialize.
2. There is guidance of the gifted student that results in an appropriate division of scholastic emphasis to build skills both in the usual curriculum and to meet individual needs.
3. Gifted children whose strengths are in non-academic areas have the opportunity for activities focused on developing those strengths as well as on their academic progress.
4. The reporting of school progress to parents recognize the particular needs of the gifted child.

To summarize, program balance refers to educational planning for the student which includes instruction in the general curriculum content and in the specialized gifted program in degrees which represent appropriate amounts of each, based on the determination of the needs of the gifted child by an individual or individuals qualified to make such decisions. For both elementary grade only and junior-senior high school only programs, the factor of program balance was rated as being of average emphasis, while other combinations of assignments/interests tended to regard program balance as having a major emphasis in their

program.

Insert Table 7 about here

Also found significant at the .05 level was the crosstab relative to the emphasis given guidance as a program component and the major assignment/interest of the GT teacher. A high percentage (60-80%) of people in all the sub-groups (See Table 8) rated the guidance component as of average importance in the program, while 20-40% of the people in the same sub-groups reported guidance as having major importance in their programs.

Insert Table 8 about here

Comparison of the teacher's major assignment/interest with the use of community resources in the gifted program resulted in a difference significant at the .01 level. Each of the three groups of respondents rated the emphasis given the use of community resources in the gifted program in a different manner. Elementary teachers tended to consider such use as given average emphasis in their programs, while junior and senior high school teachers split in an even manner between reporting average and major emphasis on using community resources in their program. The "other" subgroup indicated the use of community resources in their programs to be of major importance.

Insert Table 9 about here

Discussion of Findings: Group A

Nine significant crosstabulations of responses to items within and between survey section IA and IB and survey section II have been described. At this point, it seems appropriate to propose some meanings that might be attached to these findings. Although each significant item may have other meanings, the author would like to suggest the following.

The emphasis rating given to the use of non-standardized tests/procedures to screen and identify gifted students by GT teachers at all grade levels was reported as average. Most teachers today appear to be well aware of the need to use a variety of standardized and non-standardized instruments and procedures to build a comprehensive "picture" of a child's strengths, weaknesses, needs, and capabilities (Gallagher, 1985). Assigning an average emphasis rating to the use of non-standardized instruments/procedures by most respondents is heartening, and may indicate that entrance into a GT program currently is based on information from a variety of instruments/procedures.

The use of continuous assessment to identify, teach and counsel GT students was given an average program emphasis rating by teachers in all the experience categories. In fact, the more years of GT experience the respondents had, the more definite the average emphasis

rating. This is an unexpected finding (to the researcher), as an increasing recognition of the need for guidance/counseling service beginning with pre-school levels has been evident in the writings of such authors as Nicholas Colangelo and James Webb. Teachers of GT students may be providing such services within the GT program, rather than involving trained counselors. Also, a number of GT teachers may have some counseling background or are, themselves, training counselors. It is possible that, in these times of economic difficulty, formal provision of guidance and counseling services is not an option for many school districts in a financial sense. The survey information is not in sufficient depth to identify the reasons for a low place on the totem pole of emphases for this program factor, and further exploration of this aspect of GT services should be made.

It has been noted that the provision of administrative grouping modifications for GT children was rated as having a major emphasis by respondents reporting on programs serving elementary grades, while programs serving all other combinations of grade levels gave such modifications an average emphasis rating. Part of this difference rating may come from the fact that elementary teachers make a variety of grouping modifications on a routine basis within their classrooms, and most GT program teachers/coordinators have an elementary education background at the present time. Although teachers at the junior and senior high school levels also arrange grouping modifications for their students, restricts such as length of period and number of different class groups, which made implementation of grouping modifications more

difficult to accomplish at this level.

No group of respondents reported acceleration of gifted students as a factor given major program emphasis, although about half of the respondents at the high school level identified acceleration as a factor with major program emphasis. While much of the literature indicates acceleration as an effective and desirable way of accomodating the needs of a gifted child when used on a case-by-case basis (Gallagher, 1988), few programs seem to use it on any consistent basis. It is possible that such usual considerations as locating teachers who are willing to and interested in working with an accelerated child over a period of years, parent interest in and willingness to have their child accelerated, and student capability to interact well with older students results in the relative non-use of acceleration. Another reason for limited use of this avenue to meet GT student needs may also result from a narrow view of acceleration as meaning grade skipping. Much successful acceleration has kept the GT student with his/her age group with acceleration limited to specific areas of strength/capability during a part of the school day.

The modest split between "small" and "large" schools over the emphasis given instructional adaptations for gifted children may result from the greater number of classes, activities, and teachers perceived to be available in larger schools. However, about half of the respondents from "small" school systems also placed major emphasis on the use of instructional adaptations. In such cases, the respondents may have been reflecting the belief that small schools can be more

flexible in meeting student needs simply because they are smaller and more "personal."

The provision of instructional adaptations might well have been expected to have been given major program emphasis by elementary GT teachers, since they rated the emphasis given to provision of administrative grouping modification as high. However, elementary teachers were divided over the importance of this program factor, while their colleagues at the high school level considered instructional adaptations were given major emphasis. The elementary GT teacher and the high school teacher may regard the adaptations presented as subheads of this item differently, due to a factor in training or personal orientation unique to each subset of teachers. It may be that these are program considerations at the elementary level which result in lessening the emphasis given to providing instructional adaptations, or, it might be that elementary teachers provide such adaptations on such a continual basis that the factor of providing instructional adaptation does not appear to receive major emphasis in their programs.

Program balance and teachers' major assignment/interest provided an interesting comparison. Up until senior high school, a balanced program for GT stduents was rated as being of major emphasis in their programs. Perhaps by senior high school, teachers felt the GT student should begin to specialize and focus his/her work, thus making a "balanced" program to be of less importance. Beginning to specialize might be urged at this level.

It was a surprise to the researcher to find that the guidance

component of GT programs was rated as having an average emphasis. Perhaps educators regard this as needed by all students at all levels, and because there is a relatively small amount of education dollars available for added services, GT teachers are taking a practical view and not giving major emphasis to something that cannot be funded. In addition, many teachers may have some background in guidance/counseling and do some general counseling with their students in a variety of ways.

The major assignment/interest of the teacher did not seem to affect the use of community resources in GT programs. All groups, except a very small group composed of a few people in special, designated positions, considered use of community resources as having an average program emphasis. This may mean that such use has been integrated in such a thorough way that it does not seem to be a major emphasis to the respondents. It could also mean that there is considerable "room" for GT programs to involve the natural and human resources available in any community to a greater degree. It is hoped this finding does not mean that GT program developers and implementers lack awareness of the resources of their communities. It is, however, necessary to remember that effective utilization of community resources is very time consuming, and many GT teachers are loaded in such a heavy way that a more modest then desired emphasis on community resources may be the result.

Conclusion: Group A

There were nine (9) cross tabulations in Group A that indicated a

significant difference between groups of respondents. Those differences, some of which were significant at the .05 and some of which were significant at the .01 level might well be considered by GT teachers and coordinators relative to their own programs. Although a certain level of emphasis has been reported as being predominant by certain groups, the value of this information is not so much seeing how well ones program fits the "profile" but to inspire one to formally look at these facets of his/her own programs to determine if and what changes would benefit the program.

The discussion of funding from this study will now focus on the significant relationships from this study, as determined by the one of the Chi Square Statistic, between items within Part II (thirteen program emphases) and a specific program emphasis. The provision for inservice training for teachers and other personnel working with the gifted child was significantly related to some of the other program emphases.

The next section of this activity will discuss each item which was determined to have a significant relationship to inservice training of teachers.

The seven significant crosstabs to be discussed within this section are to:

1. Compare the use of non-standardized tests for identification of GT students and inservice provisions.
2. Compare the articulation with prior and later schools in which the gifted student is enrolled regarding identification and program

planning for the GT child and inservice provisions.

3. Compare the instructional adaptations made for GT students and inservice provisions.
4. Compare the balance in the instructional program for GT students and inservice provisions.
5. Compare the provisions for special equipment and facilities for GT students and inservice provisions.
6. Compare the use of community resources in GT program planning and development and inservice provisions.
7. Compare the provision for continuous assessment for identifying, teaching, and counseling GT students and inservice provisions.

Presentation of Findings - Group B

The crosstab information provided by looking at the use of non-standardized tests/procedures to identify GT students and the provisions for inservice training for teachers and other personnel working with such children indicated the following. Those respondents who indicated inservice was given average emphasis in their program also rated the utilization of non-standardized tests/procedures as of average emphasis. Those who rated inservice as having a major emphasis in their programs rated the use of non-standardized test with high emphasis. This finding was significant at the .01 level.

Insert Table 10 about here

The emphasis given continuous program assessment of GT programs

relative to the emphasis given inservice provisions also constituted a relationship significant at the .01 level. This crosstab indicated that those respondents who indicated inservice was given average emphasis in their programs reported average emphasis on continuous program assessment. In a similar manner, those who rated inservice as having a high program emphasis rated the use of continuous program asessment highly.

Insert Table 11 about here

When looking at inservice and the instructional adaptations made for gifted students, it once again appears that respondents were consistent. Those individuals who indicated their program gave an average emphasis rating to inservice also gave an average emphasis rating to the importance of instructional adaptations in their program. Those who rated inservice provisions as a high emphasis program factor also gave a high emphasis rating to instructional program adaptations. This finding was significant at the .01 level.

Insert Table 12 about here

Looking at the relative emphasis rating given inservice provisions and the balance of the instructional program for gifted students, it may be noted that those respondents who reported given an average emphasis to inservice in their programs rated the emphasis on having a

balanced GT instructional program as average. Those who rated the emphasis level given inservice as major, rated the importance of having a balanced GT program as a major emphasis area. The significance level of this finding was .05.

Insert Table 13 about here

Another significant crosstab, at the .01 level, was providing special equipment and facilities and inservice provisions. These individuals who rated the emphasis given equipment/facilities for the GT program as of average importance considered the emphasis on inservice to be average. In a similar manner, those who reported a major emphasis given to inservice provisions reported a major emphasis given to providing special equipment/facilities for the GT program.

Insert Table 14 about here

The relationship between inservice provisions and provisions for articulation between schools students were and are attending was significant at the .01 level. Those respondents placing average emphasis on one of the factors also placed average emphasis on the other. However, the group which placed major emphasis on both factors was only slightly larger (5.8%) than the group which placed major emphasis on articulation and average emphasis on inservice provisions.

The final significant crosstab found within the thirteen program

emphases presented in survey section II, involved the emphasis rating reported for inservice provisions and that reported for emphasis given use of community resources for GT students. This relationship was found to be significant at the .01 level. Those respondents who gave an average emphasis rating to inservice provisions also rated the emphasis on guidance services as average. Those who rated inservice provisions as having a major emphasis in the GT program also rated the emphasis given guidance service as major.

Insert Table 15 about here

Discussion of Findings Group B

We have seen that the relationship between inservice provisions for those working with gifted students and the use of non-standardized tests in the identification of GT students, the articulation with other schools the GT student has or will attend, the provision of instructional adaptation for GT students, the emphasis on providing a balanced program for these students, provision of equipment and facilities for the GT program, use of community resources in the GT program, and continuous assessment of the gifted child for identification, teaching, and counseling purposes to be significant.

This finding identifies areas relative to programs for gifted children where inservice can make a difference. In these areas, those respondents who reported an average emphasis given to the items noted above reported an average emphasis on inservice. In a similar manner,

those who rated these items as having major program emphasis rated the emphasis on inservice as being of major importance.

The seven items related at a significant level are among those which are important to the functioning and development of effective programs for gifted children. It would seem appropriate to focus inservice efforts on those areas under certain circumstances. For example, if the GT teacher/coordinator feels the GT program should be stronger in one or more of the items than it is at the current time, inservice might focus on that item. On the other hand, should an overall program review indicate the current level of emphasis on these items to be appropriate, the GT teacher/coordinator might use these findings to affirm the program is "on tract" relative to those items.

Conclusion: Group B

Providing inservice for those persons working with GT children is an important area to implement. The emphasis given to it seems to be reflected in the emphasis given to several significant factors of GT programs. If a factor is perceived to need more emphasis in a program, it would appear that increasing the emphasis on it through increased inservice activities might result in more emphasis on that factor in the program.

Final Statement

There are a number of factors relative to programs for gifted students and the people who are responsible for planning and implementing them that have a significant relationship. Applying this information, as appropriate, to one's program should result in program improvement.

References

Davis, Gary A. and Rimm, Sylvia B. (1985). Education of the Gifted and Talented. (pp. 53-54). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gallagher, James A. (Third Edition). 1985. Teaching The Gifted Child. (pp. 18-19, 359-364). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Kitano, Margie K. and Kirby, Darrell F. 1986. Gifted Education A Comprehensive View. (p. 350). Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

State of Iowa. Department of Public Instruction, Curriculum Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 52319. Publication #4200-C55660-10/76.

Appendices

A = Survey Section IA

B = Survey Section IB

C = Survey Section II

D = Summary Statement from initial anlysis of Section IA & IB

E = Summary Statement from initial analysis of Section II

Appendix A

Survey Section IA

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. District:

2. Superintendent:

3. TAG Contact (Name and Phone #):

4. Number of students served:

5. Grade level(s) served:

6. AEA serving your district:

7. First year of implementation:

8. Please circle the gifted area(s) your program serves.

   1. General Intellectual Ability 2. Creative Ability 3. Visual Performing Arts 4. Specific Academic Ability 5. Leadership Ability

   6. Other_____

9. Please circle the program model your program uses.

   1. Pull-out 2. Teacher-coordinator 3. Coordinator 4. Mentor

   5. Other_____

10. Special feature(s) of your program. Circle those appropriate. Add to the list if the feature you use is not given.

    1. Bloom 2. Triad 3. Advanced Placement 4. Acceleration

    5. Independent Study 6. SOI 7. Other_____

11. GT teacher's background in gifted education. Circle all those which apply. Write in other experience if these headings do not reflect your background.

    1. College courses 2. In-service 3. Workshops (AEA) 4. National meetings 5. State meetings 6. Independent-Study 7. Other_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Survey Section IB

More Specific Information About Your GT Program

Directions: Check one answer to each item A through D, and enter your work experience as indicated in items E and F.

Section I

A. Member of:
- _____a. Instructional staff
- _____b. Administration staff
- _____c. Guidance and counseling staff
- _____d. Special Services staff
- _____e. Supervisory staff
- _____f. Community (i.e., parent or lay citizen)
- _____g. Student body

B. Professional assignment or major interest is primarily in:
- _____a. Nursery or kindergarten grades
- _____b. Primary grades (1-3)
- _____c. Intermediate grades (4-6)
- _____d. Total elementary level (K-6)
- _____e. Junior High School
- _____f. Senior High School
- _____g. Total secondary level
- _____h. System-wide (K-12)

C. Primary professional responsibility in area of:
- _____a. Elementary school studies
- _____b. Art
- _____c. Business or distributive education
- _____d. Core, block, or unified studies
- _____e. Foreign language
- _____f. Home economics
- _____g. Industrial and vocational arts
- _____h. Language arts and English
- _____i. Mathematics
- _____j. Music
- _____k. Sciences
- _____l. Social Studies
- _____m. Special Education

D. Number of years as teacher or other professional educator
- _____a. 1-3
- _____b. 4-6
- _____c. 7-9
- _____d. 10-12
- _____e. More than 12

E. Number of years you have worked with gifted children _____

F. Number of years you have worked in your current GT position _____

Appendix C

Survey Section II

Section II

Directions: Check all subitems under items #1-13 that describe your program to any degree. Then, in the blank immediately to the left of each numbered item (1-13), rate the strength this aspect of programming for gifted children has in your program as follows:

3 = major emphasis in the program
2 = average emphasis in the program
1 = little emphasis in the program
0 = no emphasis in the program

____1. Attention is given to the following talent areas for program planning, definition, and program purpose.
- ____a. General intellectual area
- ____b. Special academic areas (such as mathematics, science, social studies, etc.)
- ____c. Creative arts (such as music, art, creative writing, dancing)
- ____d. Mechanical arts and skills
- ____e. Social or executive leadership

____2. Standardized tests and inventories are used specifically for the identification of GT students.
- ____a. Group intelligence tests
- ____b. Individual intelligence tests
- ____c. Achievement tests and batteries
- ____d. Reading tests
- ____e. Diagnostic and prognostic tests
- ____f. Special aptitude tests and batteries
- ____g. Interest inventories
- ____h. Character and personality tests
- ____i. There is a periodic, comprehensive standardized testing program.
- ____j. Other

____3. Non-standardized tests and procedures are specifically used for the identification of GT students.
- ____a. Sociometric ratings
- ____b. Projective tests and techniques
- ____c. Teacher-made or school-produced tests
- ____d. Teacher rating scales
- ____e. Situational and performance tests
- ____f. Interview data
- ____g. Other

____4. Provisions are made for continuous assessment, specifically for identifying, teaching, and counseling GT students.
- ____a. Data from 2 above are included in cumulative records.
- ____b. Data from 3 above are included in cumulative records.
- ____c. There is a periodic review of cumulative record data.
- ____d. Provisions are made for access to and assistance in using cumulative records by appropriate personnel for studying talented students.
- ____e. Cumulative records are transmitted to the next school and teachers are notified of talented students in their classes.
- ____f. A periodic audit is made of all cumulative records for clues to identification and development of talented students.
- ____g. Other

____5. There is articulation with other schools from which students come or to which they go for the purpose of identifying and planning for the GT child.
- ____a. The assessment program for identifying talented students is cooperatively developed.
- ____b. Special attention is called to data on talented students.
- ____c. Special reviews are made of cumulative records of talented students.
- ____d. Program modifications and instructional adaptations made for the talented are cooperatively studied to ascertain meaning for planning for each level.
- ____e. Unusual learning experiences and educational attainment of the talented are described and communicated to other schools.
- ____f. Other

____6. There are administrative grouping modifications for the GT child.
- ____a. Gifted students are grouped in separate sections or classes for instruction in the area of their special talents.
- ____b. Gifted students are grouped in separate sections for all instruction.
- ____c. Gifted students are placed in special interest groups.
- ____d. Gifted students are grouped for differentiated experiences and individualized activities in the regular classroom.
- ____e. Talented students are enrolled in out-of-school groups for special experiences in their area of talent.
- ____f. Certain courses are open only to students of outstanding ability and/or achievement.
- ____g. Talented students are encouraged to take courses in non-academic areas to supplement their area of talent or interest.
- ____h. Talented students are enrolled in special activities such as seminars, independent study, and tutorials restricted to pupils of outstanding ability.
- ____i. Certain club groups or extraclass activities are open only to those who are particularly talented in that particular area.
- ____j. Other

____7. There are provisions for administratively accelerating GT students.
- ____a. Gifted students are admitted to the school at an earlier-than-normal age.
- ____b. Gifted students are accelerated or promoted to an appropriate grade or subject level.
- ____c. Gifted students are in a multiple-track or other plan for rapid progress (e.g., grouped in sections together and able to complete a 3-year program in 2 years or 2 years in 1).
- ____d. Gifted students are permitted to enroll in one or more additional subjects each semester or year and thus complete a program earlier or take advanced work.
- ____e. Gifted students can take advanced (or college level) courses either at the school or at a nearby college.
- ____f. Gifted students can complete advanced work in summer sessions.
- ____g. Multi-grade or ungraded classes are used for talented students to facilitate their rapid progress.
- ____h. Gifted students are encouraged to enroll in colleges earlier than usual.
- ____i. Other

____8. Instructional adaptations are made for GT students.
- ____a. Instructional goals for the gifted are different from those for other students and have been clarified.
- ____b. Gifted students are encouraged and helped to progress at their own rate.
- ____c. Gifted students are encouraged and aided in developing individual or group projects in their talent areas, and to evaluate their own growth and development.
- ____d. The content of learning is differentiated, providing greater depth and/or breadth of dealing with more complex and abstract ideas and processes.
- ____e. Teaching techniques are modified to take into account the learning characteristics and needs of the gifted: methods stress interpretation, generalization, abstraction, conceptualization, and relationship-building, and minimize routine drill and other repetitive activities.
- ____f. Special teaching and learning materials are provided for the talented when required - more advanced books, laboratory resources, etc.
- ____g. Daily and weekly schedules are made flexible for the gifted.
- ____h. Extra opportunities for exploration and independent study are provided for the talented.
- ____i. Assignments and requirements are modified for the talented to provide for more intensive study or advanced attainment.
- ____j. Talented students are given opportunities to serve as teacher assistants, and/or laboratory assistants, in their area of talent.
- ____k. Gifted students are instructed and helped with study habits, library skills, reading skills, and the tools for learning how to learn.
- ____l. Other

____9. There is an overall balance in the instructional program for the GT child (children).
- ____a. The program strikes a balance between building a sound general educational foundation and providing opportunities for exploration and specialization.
- ____b. The talented are guided into balanced programs neither over-specializing in nor neglecting activities necessary for the development of particular aptitudes.
- ____c. The talented with both non-academic aptitudes and superior intellectual ability are guided into programs which develop these special aptitudes as well as their academic potential.
- ____d. Assignments of grades, evaluation procedures, and reports to parents take into consideration the particular needs of the talented.
- ____e. Other

___10. There are provisions for special equipment and facilities needed for GT children.
- ____a. Space provided for experimental and research equipment used by the talented in science can remain assembled for long periods of time.
- ____b. Special music rooms are available for individual and group practice.
- ____c. A section for advanced reference materials and for independent study and research is set aside.
- ____d. Studios and equipment for advanced art work are provided.
- ____e. Equipment and facilities required and to be used only by the talented are furnished.

_____f. There is a special allocation of funds for instructional supplies for gifted students.
_____g. Other

___11. There are guidance and counseling provisions for the GT children.
_____a. Educational, vocational, and personal counseling are specifically tailored to the needs of the talented.
_____b. Counselors and teachers of each talented student participate regularly in case conferences to consider his academic, physical, social, and emotional development.
_____c. Talented students with emotional or social difficulties or with a marked discrepancy between potential and achievement are provided with counseling.
_____d. Talented students are referred to community service agencies when this is advisable.
_____e. Financial aid is sought for talented students who need this assistance.
_____f. Periodic conferences are arranged with the parents of talented students to review school progress and to consider special needs in the home, the school, and the community.
_____g. A follow-up of the progress of graduates is made regularly to aid the school in evaluating its program for the talented.
_____h. Each talented student is assigned to a teacher and a counselor for study and assistance.
_____i. Other

___12. Community resources - personnel and material - are used in planning and developing the GT program.
_____a. Community specialists are used in instructional and other program activities for the talented.
_____b. Seminars and other out-of-school activities in areas of talent are provided in cooperation with community specialists and youth-serving agencies.
_____c. Work experiences and apprenticeships in areas of talent are provided in cooperation with businesses, industries, laboratories, and service agencies.
_____d. Supervised field trips are build around student talent areas.
_____e. Laboratories, libraries, and other community facilities are used to extend learning opportunities for the talented.
_____f. Other

___13. There are provisions for in-service training for teachers and other personnel working with the GT child.
_____a. In-service activities include study and workshop groups focusing on content, methods, and materials for the talented.
_____b. Opportunities are provided to experiment with instructional materials and classroom practices as well as with administrative arrangements for the talented.
_____c. Teachers who work with the talented are given special inservice assistance.
_____d. Outside consultants are made available to work with teachers in developing their competencies for working with the talented.
_____e. Teachers of the talented may have leaves to study and increase their competence for working with these students.
_____f. Teachers may visit other classes and schools to observe programs and practices for the talented.

Appendix D

Initial Analysis Statements: Section IA & IB

(1) There is a GT program of some type in 197 of Iowa's 436 public school districts.

(2) GT programs are found in school districts in all geographic areas and of all population sizes in Iowa.

(3) One hundred forty-four Iowa GT programs have an enrollment of 50 or fewer students, representing 3% of the total school population in each of these districts.

(4) While Iowa GT programs may be found at all grade levels, the majority are at elementary and junior high/middle school grades.

(5) Sixty percent of GT programs in Iowa were less than six years old in 1985.

(6) Ninety-six percent of Iowa GT programs serve the intellectually gifted child, with some also serving at least one other type of giftedness.

(7) Eighty-seven percent of Iowa GT programs utilize some variation of a pullout program.

(8) Iowa GT programs are based on one or more well-known approaches to teaching GT students, such as those developed by Renzulli, Betts, Feldhusen, etc.

(9) Iowa GT programs which have been in existence for 6-10 years are sometimes revised to include an approach developed since their original major program approach was chosen. An example would be a Renzulli Triad based program with Betts Autonomous Learner model as an overlay.

(10) The background of the Iowa GT teacher is one of great variety. (Iowa does not have an endorsement/certification requirement for GT teachers.)

(11) Over 90% of the Iowa GT teachers have self-educated themselves in this (GT) area through various types of experiences and study such as workshops, college courses, and inservice activities.

(12) Most Iowa GT teachers currently work at the elementary grade levels.

(13) Forty-six percent of Iowa teachers have regular elementary classroom experience with 91% having more than three years of experience in elementary education.

(14) In 1985-86, 71% of Iowa GT teachers had under five years of experience in their current GT position.

Appendix E

Initial Analysis Statements: Section II

To summarize, this survey considered the emphasis factor of thirteen aspects of GT program building, implementation, and maintenance. The observations which follow summarize major points and conclusions.

1. Use of non-standardized tests/procedures in identification received the highest emphasis rating by respondents.
2. The second highest rated statement denoting emphasis given in the program was making the choice of type(s) of giftedness to be served by the program.
3. Least emphasized in GT programs were such things as guidance/counseling services, use of community resources, and use of acceleration in the program.
4. The most-often-chosen area of giftedness to be served was general intellectual ability, but at least one other area was served in 78% of the program.
5. Identification was linked to performance on intelligence tests and achievement tests.
6. Teacher rating scales are used in 80% of the programs as the type of non-standardized identification instrument.
7. Outside of data on the cumulative record maintained for all children, there seems to be little formal record keeping in the area of continuous assessment.
8. Articulation with other schools concerning GT student records

is limited.

9. Grouping modifications for the GT child take a wide variety of forms.
10. Acceleration seems to be underused as a way to meet the educational needs of gifted students.
11. A wide variety of instructional adaptations are made for GT students within the GT program.
12. While programs are "balanced" between the regular and special curriculum, less emphasis is placed on program aspects dealing with non-academic abilities and evaluation than on academic/intellectual abilities.
13. Funds are allocated for purchase of instructional supplies for gifted students.
14. Special facilities and equipment are seldom available in the areas of music and art.
15. Outside of parent-teacher conferences, the guidance/counseling aspects of most programs is weak.
16. The greatest use of community resources involves using resource people and field trips.
17. A variety of types of inservice was reported for the GT teacher, some of which implied training for all the GT child's teachers.

Table 1

Comparing Respondents' Assignment Using Nonstandardized Tests/ Procedures

	Non-Standardized Tests	
Major Assignment	Average Emphasis Rating	Major Emphasis Rating
Elementary grade	74%	26%
Special subject area and/or administration	58%	42%
Other	43%	57%

Table 2

Comparing Continuous Assessment and Respondents' Years in Present Position

	Continuous Assessment	
	Average Emphasis	High Emphasis
Years in Present Postion	Rating	Rating
1 year	56%	44%
2-3 years	55%	45%
4 or more years	93%	7%

Table 3

Administrative Grouping Modifications and Grade Levels Served by the Program

	Grouping Provided	
Grade Level Served	Average Emphasis Rating	High Emphasis Rating
Elementary	44%	56%
Elementary and junior high	65%	35%
Elementary and senior high	64.5%	35.5%
Junior and senior high	100%	0%
Other groupings	65.5%	34.5%

Table 4

Use of Acceleration and the Grade Level(s) Served

	Acceleration	
	Average Emphasis	High Emphasis
Grade Level(s) Served	Rating	Rating
Elementary grades	53%	47%
Elementary and junior high	72.5%	27.5%
Elementary and senior high	71%	29%
Junior and senior high	50%	50%
Other grade level mixtures	86%	14%

Table 5

Instructional Adaptations and the Total School Enrollment

	Instructional Adaptation	
	Average Emphasis	High Emphasis
Total School Enrollment	Rating	Rating
1,000 or fewer students	48%	52%
Over 1,000 students	30.5%	69.5%

Table 6

Instructional Adaptations Students and the Major Assignment of Respondents

Respondent's Major Assignment	Instructional Adaptation	
	Average Emphasis Rating	High Emphasis Rating
Elementary	49.5%	50.5%
Junior/senior high	14%	86%
All other combinations	35%	65%

Table 7

Respondent's Major Assignment and Program Balance

Respondent's Major Assignment/Interest	Program Balance: Average Emphasis Rating	Program Balance: High Emphasis Rating
Elementary	67%	33%
Junior/senior high	57%	43%
All other combinations	44%	56%

Table 8

Respondent's Major Assignment and Program Guidance Component

Respondent's Major Assignment/Interest	Guidance Component: Average Emphasis Rating	Guidance Component: High Emphasis Rating
Elementary	80%	20%
Junior/senior high	64%	36%
All other combinations	60%	40%

Table 9

Emphasis Rating of Respondent's Major Assignment/Interest and the Use of Community Resources

Respondent's Major Assignment/Interest	Community Resources: Average Emphasis Rating	Community Resources: High Emphasis Rating
Elementary	68%	32%
Junior high	50%	50%
All other combinations	44%	56%

Table 10

Inservice Provision and Non-Standardized Tests/Procedures

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Use of Non-Standardized Tests/Procedures in Identification Emphasis	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	72%	28%
Major emphasis	53%	47%

Table 11

Inservice Provisions and Continuous Assessment

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Continuous Assessment Emphasis	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	70%	30%
Major emphasis	45%	55%

Table 12

Inservice Provisions and Instructional Adaptations for Gifted Students

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Instructional Adaptations Emphasis	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	49%	51%
Major emphasis	29%	71%

Table 13

Inservice Provisions and a Balanced Instructional Program

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Program Balance Emphasis	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	62.5%	37.5%
Major emphasis	47%	53%

Table 14

Inservice Provisions and Provision of Special Equipment and Facilities

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Equipment and Facilities Provisions	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	79%	21%
Major emphasis	56.5%	43.5%

Table 15

Provisions for Articulation Between Schools Attended and Inservice Provisions

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Provision for Articulation Between Schools	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	73.2%	47.1%
Major emphasis	26.8%	52.9%

Table 16

Inservice Provisions and Provisions for Use of Community Resources

Inservice Provision Emphasis	Provisions for Use of Community Resources	
	Average Emphasis	Major Emphasis
Average emphasis	65%	35%
Major emphasis	43.5%	56.5%